IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY, THE NINETEENTH DAY OF JANUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

**THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY**

**WRIT PETITION NO : 25252 of 2004**

Between:

J. Ramesh S/o Natarajan
R/o Nalgonda Village, Chittoor District

**..... PETITIONER**

AND

1 The Superintendent of Police, Chittoor District
2 The Station House Officer, Aliperi Police Station,

Tirupathi, Chittoor District.

3. P.Shankar Naidu, S/o.Changalarayanaidu, R/o. N.Kattakindapalle, E.Kottur, Irala Mandal, Chittor District.

4. V.Venkata Prasad, S/o. Ramachandranaidu, R/o. Gundlapalle Village and Post, Business, T.Sundupalle Mandal, Kadapa District.

5. P.Rama Mohan Naidu, S/o. Sanjeevaiah Naidu, Business, R/o. Ramanagr, Rajampet, Kadapa District.

6. M.Venkataiah Naidu, S/o. Pitchaiah Naidu, Business, R/o. Kadapa Main Road, Rajampet, Kadapa District.

7. M/s. Suja Company, Rep. by its Power of Attorney holder P.Shankaranaidu, S/o. Chengalarayudu naidu, R/o. N.Kottakindapalle, E.Kottur Post, Irala Mandal, Chittor District.

8. R.Subrahmanyam Raju, S/o. Rudhraraju, Chengalraju, R/o. S.B.R.Puam Village & Post, Vadamalapeta Mandal, Chittor District.

9. R.Rajeswari Raju, W/o. Subrahmanyam Raju,

(petitioners 6 & 7 are presently residing at 829 Heath Lane, Westmont IL 60559,

U.S.A.)

10. D.Lakshmana Raju, S/o. Ramaraju, 42 years.

11. Smt. D.Radha, W/o. Lakshmanaraju, 36 years.

(Petitioner 8 & 9 are R/o. 413 E. 58th Street, Westmont IL 60559 U.S.A.)

(Petitioners 6 to 9 are residing at U.S.A. and their S.P.A.Holder Sri R.Vijayabhaskar Raju S/o. Narasaraju, aged 40 years, R/o. SBR Puram Village and Post, Vadamalapeta Mandal, Chittoor District)

(RR3 to 11 impleaded as per Court order dated 19.01.2005 in W.P.M.P.Bno.427 of 2005)

**.....RESPONDENTS**

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue an appropriate Writ, order or direction, more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus, declaring the action of the Respondents in for considering the complaint of the petitioner dated 22-10-2004 27-10-2004 and 25-12-2004 from taking section against the named accused who are violating the orders in W.P.No. 19449/2004 dt 18-11-2004 as illegal arbitrary and unconstitutional and consequently direct the respondents not to harass the petitioners by regularly calling to the police Station demanding compromise or settlement without acting upon the complaint of the petitioner by protecting the property in terms of the orders of the Hon'ble High Court in WP No. 1944/2004 dt 18-11-2004.

**Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.J.U.M.V.PRASAD**

**Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR HOME**

**The Court at the admission stage made the following :**

**ORDER:**

The grievance of the petitioner is that though he submitted complaints dated 22.10.2004, 27.10.2004, and 25.12.2004, before respondents 1 and 2, no action has been taken thereon. He seeks appropriate directions in this regard.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Government Pleader for Home and

learned counsel for the impleaded respondents.

In the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition, the circumstances, under which the petitioner had approached this Court by filing W.P.No.19449 of 2004, are stated. The purport of the three complaints referred to above is that the persons named therein as accused are violating the orders of this Court, dated 18.11.2004 in W.P.No.19449 of 2004. Even if, the complaint of the petitioner is taken at its face value, there is very little that can be expected from respondents 1 and 2 to do in the matter. Once the dispute is the subject matter of a writ petition before this Court, the petitioner had to work out his remedies in appropriate proceedings before this Court itself. Respondents 1 and 2 cannot be expected to understand the scope of the orders passed by this Court, much less to take any steps for implementation of the same, on the basis of their own understanding. While the same was pointed out, learned counsel for the petitioner had stated that he would advise his client to pursue his remedies in accordance with law.

Hence, the writ petition is disposed of, leaving it open to the petitioner to work out his remedies in accordance with law. There shall be no order as to costs.

_____

19.01.2005

**Jsu**

To

1 The Superintendent of Police, Chittoor District
2 The Station House Officer, Aliperi Police Station, Tirupathi,

Chittoor District

3 2CCs to the G.P for Home, High Court Buildings,

Hyderabad(0.U.T).

4 2CD copies